

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
3 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
4 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

6 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
7 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
8 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
9 Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
10 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: 202-538-8000  
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

11 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
12 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111  
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

15 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*

16  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION

19 CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,  
20 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER  
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,  
21 individually and on behalf of all similarly  
situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 GOOGLE LLC,  
25 Defendant.

26 Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

27  
28 **GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS OF  
GOOGLE'S MOTIONS TO EXCLUDE  
OPINIONS OF PLAINTIFFS' EXPERTS  
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION  
FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

1           **I. INTRODUCTION**

2           Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully  
 3 seeks to seal certain portions of Google’s Motions to Exclude Testimony in Support of Plaintiffs’  
 4 Motion for Class Certification (“Google’s Motions to Exclude”), which contain Google’s confidential  
 5 and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and  
 6 operations that Google does not share publicly, including various types of Google’s internal projects,  
 7 data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics. This  
 8 information is highly confidential and should be protected.

9           This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in Google’s  
 10 Opposition:

<b>Document</b>	<b>Portions to be Filed Under Seal</b>	<b>Basis for Sealing</b>
Google LLC’s Notice of Motion and Motion to Exclude Opinions of Plaintiffs’ Damages Expert Michael J. Lasinski	Highlighted portions at: Pages 4:4, 4:5, 7:22, 7:25, 7:28, 8:3, 8:7-8, 8:10, 8:14, 8:19-20, 8:23-24, 9:8, 9:11, 9:14, 9:28, 10:3-4, 10:7, 11:26, 20:10, 20:19, 20:21, 20:28	The information requested to be sealed contains Google’s highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations, including various types of Google’s internal projects, identifiers, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google’s competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google’s competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk

		of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Exhibit 1 to Trebicka Declaration  Lasinski Deposition Excerpts	Highlighted portions at:  Pages 52:18, 52:20, 53:2-3, 53:5, 53:20, 54:22, 55:1, 147:23, 148:5, 149:5-7, 161:14, 161:22, 163:9-10, 170:7, 170:9, 170:11-12, 171:13, 171:16, 172:4-5, 173:11, 173:13, 173:15, 174:5, 174:18-19, 174:21-23, 174:25, 175:3-6, 175:9, 175:12, 177:8, 177:18-19, 177:22-23, 178:3, 178:7, 178:9-10, 178:13, 179:12, 182:9, 188:13, 189:4, 189:6, 189:22, 189:24, 190:5, 191:25, 192:15, 192:23, 193:2, 193:11, 193:13, 193:23, 194:5, 194:11, 195:8, 195:12, 195:22, 196:17, 196:19, 196:21-23, 197:10, Word Index Pages 1-3, 8, 10-11, 28, 52	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects and metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.
	Exhibit 2 to Trebicka Declaration  Declaration of Bruce Strombom ISO Google's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification	Highlighted portions at:  Pages i, ii, 1, 3-6, 16-17, 19, 21, 27, 31-39, 40-48, 51-56, 60, 62, 64-76, 78, 80-82, 84-90, 94-96, 98-102, 104-112; Exhibit 5-10.C: all pages Appendix B - Page 1	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects, identifiers, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally

		<p>known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.</p>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Exhibit 4 to Trebicka Declaration  GOOG-CABR-00116174	<p>Highlighted portions at: Seal Entirely</p> <p>The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects, identifiers, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal business strategy, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing</p>

		products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	Exhibit 5 to Trebicka Declaration GOOG-CABR-04703695	Highlighted portions at: Seal Entirely	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects, identifiers, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.
	Exhibit 7 to Trebicka Declaration ISO Motion to Exclude Opinions of Lasinski	Highlighted portions at: Page 574:14-19	The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal projects, and their proprietary functionalities, that Google maintains as confidential

		<p>in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.</p>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	<p>Notice of Motion and Motion to Exclude Opinions of Plaintiffs' Expert Bruce Schneier</p>	<p>Highlighted portions at: Pages 7:2-4</p> <p>The information requested to be sealed contains Google's highly confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations, including various types of Google's internal metrics, that Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. Such confidential and proprietary information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services, and falls within the protected scope of the Protective Order entered in this action. See Dkt. 81 at 2-3. Public disclosure of such confidential and proprietary information could affect Google's competitive standing as competitors may alter their systems and practices relating to competing products. It may also place Google at an increased risk of cybersecurity</p>

1		threats, as third parties may seek to use the information to compromise Google's internal practices relating to competing products.
---	--	--

4           **II.     LEGAL STANDARD**

5           The common law right of public access to judicial records in a civil case is not a constitutional  
 6 right and it is “not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978)  
 7 (noting that the “right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute” and that “courts have  
 8 refused to permit their files to serve as reservoirs of . . . sources of business information that might  
 9 harm a litigant’s competitive standing”). Sealing is appropriate when the information at issue  
 10 constitutes “competitively sensitive information,” such as “confidential research, development, or  
 11 commercial information.” *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.*, 2014 WL 4965995, at  
 12 \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014); *see also Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir.  
 13 2002) (acknowledging courts’ “broad latitude” to “prevent disclosure of materials for many types of  
 14 information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or  
 15 commercial information”).

16           **III.    THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS EASILY MEET THE “GOOD CAUSE”  
 17           STANDARD AND SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

18           Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business  
 19 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 589-99. Good  
 20 cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that “contain[ ] confidential information  
 21 about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public disclosure could harm [the party] by  
 22 disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg. of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014  
 23 WL 6986068, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that could harm a litigant’s competitive  
 24 standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v.*  
 25 *Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information  
 26 “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard where that information could be  
 27 used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation omitted).

1 Google's Motions to Exclude contain confidential and proprietary information as the materials  
 2 involve highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations that Google does not  
 3 share publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to Google's internal projects,  
 4 data signals, and logs, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics. Such  
 5 information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating  
 6 and maintaining many of its important services while complying with legal and privacy obligations.

7 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google's competitive standing it  
 8 has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of  
 9 Google's proprietary systems, strategies, designs, and practices to Google's competitors. That alone is  
 10 a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-  
 11 02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google's motion to seal certain  
 12 sensitive business information related to Google's processes and policies to ensure the integrity and  
 13 security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-  
 14 02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because  
 15 "disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have");  
 16 *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting  
 17 motion to seal as to "internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publically  
 18 available").

19 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to  
 20 compromise Google's internal systems and data structures. Google would be placed at an increased  
 21 risk of cyber security threats, and data related to its users could similarly be at risk. *See, e.g., In re*  
 22 *Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing "material  
 23 concern[ing] how users' interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted"  
 24 because if made public, it "could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system"). The security  
 25 threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

26 The information Google seeks to redact, including internal projects and their proprietary  
 27 functions, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and operations  
 28 from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek

1 access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The “good cause” rather than the “compelling  
2 reasons” standard should apply but under either standard, Google’s sealing request is warranted.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court seal identified portions  
5 of Google’s Motions to Exclude.

6 DATED: August 5, 2022

7 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

8 By */s/ Andrew H. Schapiro*

9 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted pro hac vice)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
10 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
11 Chicago, IL 60606  
12 Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

13 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
14 sb@quinnemanuel.com  
15 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
16 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
17 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

18 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
19 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
20 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
21 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

22 Jomaire Crawford (admitted pro hac vice)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
23 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
24 New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
25 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

26 Josef Ansorge (admitted pro hac vice)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
27 Washington D.C., 20005

1 Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
2 Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

3 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
4 jonathantse@quinnmanuel.com  
5 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
6 San Francisco, CA 94111  
7 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
8 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC